

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes new Fig. 7.

Attachment: 1 New Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 6, 11, 13, and 19 are amended.

No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, the drawings were objected to; and Claims 1-5, 11-13, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Claims 6-10 and 14-18 were allowed.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the allowance of Claims 6-10 and 14-18.

With regard to the objection to the drawings, new Figure 7 included herewith illustrates the subject matter recited in Claims 1, 6, and 14. Specifically, Figure 7 shows a rolling body 18 with two ribs 20. Ribs 20 are concavo-convex portions, as described, for example on page 3, lines 25-27 and page 9, lines 7-19, and thus Figure 7 is supported by the specification. Further, a rolling body with two ribs 20, as shown in Figure 7, has “a radius that varies along an axis of rotation of the rotating body.” Thus, all of the features of Claims 1, 6, and 14 (and all claims dependent therefrom) are now shown in the drawings. The specification has been amended to include a brief description of Figure 7, and references to Figure 7 and ribs 20 in the detailed description. No new matter is added. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings is believed to be overcome.

With regard to the rejection of 1-5, 11-13, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the description of a concavo-convex portion in the specification supports the subject matter recited in Claim 1. For example, it is believed that at least page 9, lines 7-19 describes the subject matter recited in Claim 1. Page 9, lines 7-19 teaches a concavo-convex portion that forms a gap between the adhesive roll 21 and the

rolling body 18. Preferred heights of the concavo-convex portion (from the surface of the rolling body) are also provided. The concavo-convex portion is further described as a rib, a convex portion, a recess portion, or a crimping surface. New Figure 7 shows a pair of ribs that are configured to maintain the adhesive roll at a distance from the surface of the rolling body 18, as described at page 9, lines 7-19. Thus, the exemplary rolling body shown in Figure 7 has a radius that varies along an axis of rotation of the rolling body.

The outstanding Office Action stated at page 4, lines 1-6 that the specification was vague as to the manner of applying the ribs, and thus the original specification does not describe the features of claim 1 with sufficient specificity to support such a recitation. However, it is respectfully submitted that at least the above-discussed description at page 9, lines 7-19 of a concavo-convex portion that forms a gap between the rolling body and the adhesive body adequately describes “a rotating body having a radius that varies along an axis of rotation of the rotating body.” Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter recited in Claim 1 is supported by the original specification, and thus Claim 1 is in compliance with all requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 12 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, it is respectfully submitted that the specification describes a rolling body having at least two concavo-convex portions. For example, page 9, lines 9-10 describes a rolling body having at least two concavo-convex portions. Accordingly, the recitation of “at least one” in Claims 12 and 20 is believed to be supported by the original specification. Thus, Claims 12 and 20 are believed to be in compliance with all requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 11, 13, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, Claim 6 is amended to delete “having an abrasive surface,” and Claims 11, 13, and 19 are amended to delete the phrase “at least one of.” Accordingly, Claims 11, 13, and

19 are believed to be in compliance with all requirements under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Accordingly, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



J. Derek Mason, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 35,270

Katherine D. Pauley
Registration No. 50,607

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)